

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-11 and 13-18 are pending in the application. Claims 8 and 12 were previously cancelled. Claims 15 and 18 are currently cancelled. Claims 14 and 17 are amended herein. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13, 14, 16 and 17 remain for consideration.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

The Examiner rejects claims 14, 16 and 17 as being anticipated by Poulson (U.S. Patent No. 5,938,137). The Examiner states that:

In response to Applicant's arguments, it is true that the hook and eye connection of Poulson does not eliminate all movement between the two modules; however, it does restrain movement and prevents certain movements altogether. Since the claim language does not require a cessation of movement and Poulson does "substantially" prevent movement, the degree of play between modules seen in the Poulson reference does not surpass the amount made permissible by the claim language.

Figure 1 of Poulson teaches a portable device as recited in claims 14 and 17 comprising an attachment module (16, 20, 22, 24 including the entire hook) for removably connecting to a wearer (the clip connects it to the wearer yet it is removable) and a display module (cell phone case 10 and the display of the telephone mentioned on column 1, lines 55-59) defining a window for displaying information (cell phone cases have windows for at least displaying the selection buttons of the numeral pad as confirmed by column 1, lines 55-58) wherein said display module is extendably and retractably (the leash cord extends and retracts) connected to said attachment module (the leash cord is connected to its housing, 16) wherein the display module and said attachment module are adapted to be substantially prevented from moving relative to one another when said display module and said attachment module are retractable connected (when the hook is coupled to the eye as shown in Figure 1, the

display module cannot be moved away from attachment module and vice versa.)

Claims 14 and 17 are amended to incorporate the limitations of objected to claims. Amended claims 14 and 17 are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 16 depends from amended claim 14, which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. Claim 16 is submitted to be in condition for allowance for at least this reason.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant makes note the Examiner allows claims 1-7, 9-11 and 13. Applicant further notes the Examiner objects to claims 15 and 18 stating they “would be allowable if rewritten in independent from including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Rejected claims 14 and 17 are amended to incorporate the limitations of dependant claims 15 and 18. Therefore, amended claims 14 and 17 are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Considering the foregoing, it is sincerely believed that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

This paper is intended to constitute a complete response to the outstanding Office Action. Please contact the undersigned if it appears that a portion of this response is missing or if there remain any additional matters to resolve. If the Examiner feels that processing of the application can be expedited in any respect by a personal conference, please consider this an invitation to contact the undersigned by phone.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4-15-05


James F. Lea III, Reg. No. 41,143

FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP,
BAILEY & TIPPENS, P.C.
321 South Boston, Suite 800
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103-3318
(918) 599-0621

Customer Number: 22206

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT

W306415